arXiv:1404.7405v1 [math.AP] 29 Apr 2014

Backward uniqueness for parabolic operators with non-Lipschitz coefficients

Daniele Del Santo, Christian Jäh and Marius Paicu

April 30, 2014

Abstract

In this paper we study the backward uniqueness for parabolic equations with non-Lipschitz coefficients in time and space. The result presented here improves an old uniqueness theorem due to Lions and Malgrange [Math. Scand. **8** (1960), 277–286] and some more recent results of Del Santo and Prizzi [J. Math. Pures Appl. **84** (2005), 471–491; Ann. Mat. Pura Appl., to appear].

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35K15, 35R25.

1 Introduction

The question of uniqueness and non-uniqueness for solutions of partial differential equations has a fairly long history, starting form the classical works of Holmgren and Carleman. A good and rather complete survey about the results on this topic, until the early 1980's, can be found in the book of Zuily [16].

In this paper we are interested in a particular class of parabolic operators for which we consider the uniqueness property, backwards in time. Uniqueness for smooth solutions of parabolic and backward parabolic operators is not trivial. In [15] Tychonoff showed that a solution $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t \times \mathbb{R}^n_x)$ of the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta_x u = 0, & (t,x) \in \mathbb{R}_t \times \mathbb{R}^n_x \\ u(0,x) = 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^n_x, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

not necessarily vanishes. In particular, the example given by Tychonoff is such that the solution $u(t,x)$ to (1) satisfies

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n_x} \big(\max_{t \in [-T,T]} |u(t,x)| e^{-a|x|^2} \big) = +\infty, \tag{2}$$

for all $a > 0$. On the other hand Tychonoff proved that uniqueness to (1) can be obtained, for example, if one imposes $\max_{t\in[-T,T]} |u(t,x)| \leq Ce^{a|x|^2}$, for some $C,\ a > 0$. Other interesting examples of non-uniqueness for (1), under particular assumptions, can e.g. be found in [11].

Here we consider the *backward parabolic* operator

$$Pu = \partial_t u + \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j}(a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} u) + c(t,x)u, \tag{3}$$

defined on the strip $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n_x$; all the coefficients are supposed to be measurable and bounded; the 0-order coefficient $c(t,x)$ is allowed to be complex valued and we assume that the matrix $(a_{jk}(t,x))_{j,k=1}^n$ is real and symmetric for all $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n_x$ and that there exists an $a_0 \in (0,1]$ such that, for all $(t,x,\xi) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n_x \times \mathbb{R}^n_\xi$,

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk}(t,x)\xi_j\xi_k \geq a_0|\xi|^2. \tag{4}$$

Under *uniqueness property in* $\mathcal{H}$ we will mean the following: let $\mathcal{H}$ be a space of functions (in which it makes sense to look for solutions u of the equation $Pu = 0$). Then we say that the operator P has the uniqueness property in $\mathcal{H}$ if, whenever $u \in \mathcal{H}$, $Pu = 0$ on $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n_x$ and $u(0,x) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n_x$, then $u \equiv 0$ in $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n_x$.

In [7] Lions and Malgrange proved the uniqueness property for (3) in the space

$$\mathcal{H} := L^2([0,T], H^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)) \cap H^1([0,T], L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)), \tag{5}$$

(note that this choice for $\mathcal{H}$ excludes the pathological situation of (2)) under the assumption that, for all $j,k = 1,\dots,n$,

$$a_{jk}(t,x) \in \mathrm{Lip}([0,T], L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)).$$

An example of Miller in [10] showed that the regularity of the coefficients a_{jk} with respect to t should be taken under consideration, if one wants to have uniqueness in $\mathcal{H}$. In particular he constructed a nontrivial solution to the Cauchy problem for (3) with 0 initial data, for an operator having the coefficients a_{jk} in $C^\alpha([0,T], C^\infty_b(\mathbb{R}^n_x))$, for all $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{6}$.

The example of Miller was considerably improved by Mandache in [8], in the following way: consider a modulus of continuity μ which does not satisfy the Osgood condition, i.e.

$$\int_0^1 \frac{1}{\mu(s)} ds < +\infty,$$

then it is possible to construct an operator of type (3) having the regularity with respect to t of the coefficients of the principal part ruled by μ, such that this operator does not have the uniqueness property in $\mathcal{H}$.

In [5] Del Santo and Prizzi proved uniqueness for (3) in $\mathcal{H}$, under the condition that, for all $j,k = 1,\dots,n$,

$$a_{jk}(t,x) \in C^\mu([0,T], L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)) \cap L^\infty([0,T], C^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)),$$

and with the modulus of continuity μ satisfying the Osgood condition

$$\int_0^1 \frac{1}{\mu(s)} ds = +\infty. \tag{6}$$

If the result in [5] was completely satisfactory from the point of view of the regularity with respect to t, the same cannot be said for the regularity with respect to the space variables: the C^2 regularity with respect to x was a consequence of a difficulty in obtaining the Carleman estimate from which the uniqueness was deduced.

In [4] Del Santo made the technique used in [5] more effective by using a theorem of Coifman and Meyer ([2, Th. 35], see also [13, Par. 3.6]) and he could lower the regularity assumption in x from C^2 to $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ for an arbitrary small $\varepsilon > 0$.

Refining this approach Del Santo and Prizzi got in [6] the uniqueness property for (3) with the coefficients of the principal part

$$a_{jk} \in C^\mu([0,T], L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)) \cap L^\infty([0,T], \mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^n_x)).$$

In the present paper we will lower the regularity assumption for the coefficients of the principal part with respect to the space variables, going beyond the Lipschitz-continuity. The regularity with respect to x will be controlled by a modulus of continuity linked to the Osgood modulus of continuity with respect to t. More precisely we will prove that the uniqueness property in $\mathcal{H}$ for (3) holds for principal part coefficients

$$a_{jk} \in C^\mu([0,T], L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)) \cap L^\infty([0,T], C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)),$$

where μ satisfies (6) and $\omega(s) = \sqrt{\mu(s^2)}$. The proof of this uniqueness result will use the Littlewood-Paley theory and the Bony's paraproduct and will be obtained exploiting a Carleman estimate. The Carleman estimate will be proved in H^{-s} with $s \in (0,1)$ while the weight function in the Carleman estimate will be the same as that in [12].

The paper is organized as follows. First we state the uniqueness results and we give some remarks. Then we introduce the Littlewood-Paley theory and Bony's paraproduct. These tools are used in obtaining some estimates, presented in Subsection 3.3. Finally, Section 4 is devoted to the proof of the Carleman estimate needed to deduce our uniqueness theorem.

2 The uniqueness result

Definition 1. *A continuous function $\mu : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ is called modulus of continuity if it is strictly increasing, concave and satisfies $\mu(0) = 0$.*

Remark 1. *The concavity of the modulus of continuity has a list of simple consequences: for all $s \in [0,1]$ we have $\mu(s) \geq \mu(1)s$, the function $s \mapsto \mu(s)/s$ is decreasing on $(0,1]$, the limit $\lim_{s\to 0+} \mu(s)/s$ exists, the function $\sigma \mapsto \mu(1/\sigma)/(1/\sigma)$ is increasing on $[1,+\infty)$ and the function $\sigma \mapsto 1/(\sigma^2\mu(1/\sigma))$ is decreasing on $[1,+\infty)$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mu(2s) \leq C\mu(s). \tag{7}$$

Definition 2. *Let Ω be a convex set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $f : \Omega \to \mathcal{B}$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is a Banach space. We will say that f belongs to $C^\mu(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ if f is bounded and it satisfies*

$$\sup_{\substack{0<|t-s|<1 \\ t,s\in\Omega}} \frac{\|f(t) - f(s)\|_{\mathcal{B}}}{\mu(|t-s|)} < +\infty.$$

For $f \in C^\mu(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ we set

$$\|f\|_{C^\mu(\Omega,\mathcal{B})} = \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega,\mathcal{B})} + \sup_{\substack{0<|t-s|<1 \\ t,s\in\Omega}} \frac{\|f(t) - f(s)\|_{\mathcal{B}}}{\mu(|t-s|)}.$$

In case of no ambiguity we will omit the space $\mathcal{B}$ from the notation.

Definition 3. *We will say that a modulus of continuity μ satisfies the Osgood condition if*

$$\int_0^1 \frac{1}{\mu(s)} ds = +\infty. \tag{8}$$

Example 1. *A simple example of a modulus of continuity is $\mu(s) = s^\alpha$, for $\alpha \in (0,1]$. If $\alpha \in (0,1)$ (Hölder-continuity) μ does not satisfies the Osgood condition, while if $\alpha = 1$ (Lipschitz-continuity) μ satisfies the Osgood condition. Similarly $\mu(s) = s(1 + |\log(s)|)^\alpha$, for $\alpha > 0$, (Log^α-Lipschitz-continuity) satisfies the Osgood condition if and only if $\alpha \leq 1$.*

Now we state our main uniqueness result.

Theorem 1. *Let μ and ω be two moduli of continuity such that $\omega(s) = \sqrt{\mu(s^2)}$. Suppose that μ satisfies the Osgood condition. Suppose moreover that*

there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^h \frac{\omega(t)}{t} dt \leq C\omega(h); \tag{9}$$

there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $1 \leq p \leq q-1$,

$$\frac{\omega(2^{-q})}{\omega(2^{-p})} \leq C\omega(2^{p-q}); \tag{10}$$

for all $s \in (0,1)$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} 2^{(1-s)k}\omega(2^{-k}) < +\infty. \tag{11}$$

Assume that, for all $j,k=1,\dots,n$,

$$a_{jk}\in C^{\mu}([0,T],L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n_x))\cap L^{\infty}([0,T],C^{\omega}(\mathbb{R}^n_x)).$$

Then the operator P has the uniqueness property in $\mathcal{H}$, where P and $\mathcal{H}$ are defined in (3) *and* (5) *respectively.*

Remark 2. *We don't know at the present stage whether the conditions* (10) *and* (11) *are purely technical or can be removed. They are necessary to the proof of some auxiliary remainder estimates (see Section 3.3, Lemma 1). Let us remark that* (11) *is implied by the following: for all $\sigma\in(0,1)$, there exists $\delta_\sigma\in(0,1)$ and $c,\ C>0$ such that, for all $s\in[0,\delta_\sigma]$, we have $cs\le\omega(s)\le Cs^{\sigma}$.*

Remark 3. *It would be possible to prove uniqueness for an operator with terms of order one, i.e. for*

$$\tilde{P}=\partial_t+\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\partial_{x_j}(a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k})+\sum_{k=1}^{n}b_k(t,x)\partial_{x_k}+c(t,x),$$

assuming that $b_k(t,x)$ are $L^{\infty}([0,T],C^{\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^n_x))$ for some $\sigma>0$. This is due to the fact that the Carleman estimate, which we are able to prove, is in H^{-s} with $s\in(0,1)$. In [5] and [4] the Carleman estimate was proved in L^2 and this fact allowed to consider the coefficients $b_k(t,x)$ under no hypotheses on $b_k(t,x)$, apart boundedness.

Example 2. *A simple example of moduli of continuity μ and ω satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 1 is $\mu(s)=s(1+|\log(s)|)$ and $\omega(s)=s\sqrt{1+|\log(s)|}$.*

3 Littlewood-Paley theory and Bony's paraproduct

In this section we recall some well-known results of the Littlewood-Paley theory and Bony's paraproduct. These results will be fundamental tools in the proof of our Carleman estimate.

3.1 Littlewood-Paley theory

Let χ and φ be two functions in $C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n_\xi)$, with values in $[0,1]$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\operatorname{supp}(\varphi)\subseteq\{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n_\xi:\frac{3}{4}\le|\xi|\le\frac{8}{3}\},\\&\operatorname{supp}(\chi)\subseteq\{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n_\xi:|\xi|\le\frac{4}{3}\}.\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

Let, for all $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n_\xi$,

$$\chi(\xi)+\sum_{q\ge0}\varphi(2^{-q}\xi)=1,$$

i.e. $\varphi(\xi)=\chi(\frac{\xi}{2})-\chi(\xi)$. By these choices we have

$$\operatorname{supp}(\chi(2^{-q}\cdot))\subseteq\{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n_\xi:|\xi|\le\frac{4}{3}2^q\}$$

and therefore

$$\operatorname{supp}(\varphi(2^{-q}\cdot))\subseteq\{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n_\xi:\frac{3}{4}2^q\le|\xi|\le\frac{8}{3}2^q\}.$$

We get

$$\operatorname{supp}(\varphi(2^{-q}\cdot))\cap\operatorname{supp}(\varphi(2^{-p}\cdot))=\emptyset,\quad\text{for all}\quad|p-q|\ge2.\tag{13}$$

With this preparations, we define the Littlewood-Paley decomposition. Let us denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the Fourier transform on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and by $\mathcal{F}^{-1}$ its inverse. Let Δ_q and S_q, for $q\in\mathbb{Z}$, be defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\Delta_q u:=0\quad\text{if } q\le-2,\\&\Delta_{-1}u:=\chi(D_x)u=\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\chi(\cdot)\mathcal{F}(u)(\cdot)),\\&\Delta_q u:=\varphi(2^{-q}D_x)u=\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi(2^{-q}\cdot)\mathcal{F}(u)(\cdot)),\quad q\ge0\end{aligned}$$

and

$$S_q u = \chi(2^{-q} D_x)u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\chi(2^{-q}\cdot)\mathcal{F}(u)(\cdot)) = \sum_{p\le q-1} \Delta_p u, \quad q \ge 0.$$

Furthermore we denote

$$\mathrm{spec}(u) := \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{F}(u)).$$

For $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$,

$$u = \sum_{q\ge -1} \Delta_q u$$

in the sense of $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$.

The following two propositions describe the decomposition and synthesis of the classical Sobolev spaces H^s, via Littlewood-Paley decomposition. A proof of these two propositions can be found in [9, Prop. 4.1.11 and Prop. 4.1.12].

Proposition 1. *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Then a tempered distribution $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ belongs to $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ if and only if the following two conditions hold:*

(i) for all $q \ge -1$, $\Delta_q u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$,

(ii) the sequence $(\delta_q)_{q\in\mathbb{Z}_{\ge -1}}$, where $\delta_q := 2^{qs}\|\Delta_q u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}$, belongs to $l^2(\mathbb{Z}_{\ge -1})$.

Moreover, there exists $C_s \ge 1$ such that, for all $u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{C_s}\|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \le \|(\delta_q)\|_{l^2(\mathbb{Z}_{\ge -1})} \le C_s\|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}.$$

Proposition 2. *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}_{>1}$. Suppose that a sequence $(u_q)_{q\in\mathbb{Z}_{\ge -1}}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ satisfies*

(i) $\mathrm{spec}(u_{-1}) \subseteq \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n_\xi : |\xi| \le R\}$ and, for all $q \ge 0$,

$$\mathrm{spec}(u_q) \subseteq \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n_\xi : R^{-1}2^q \le |\xi| \le 2R2^q\},$$

(ii) the sequence $(\delta_q)_{q\ge -1}$, where $\delta_q := 2^{qs}\|u_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}$, belongs to $l^2(\mathbb{Z}_{\ge -1})$.

Then $u = \sum_{q\ge -1} u_q \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ and there exists $C_s \ge 1$ such that, for all $u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{C_s}\|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \le \|\delta_q\|_{l^2(\mathbb{Z}_{\ge -1})} \le C_s\|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}.$$

When $s > 0$ it is enough to assume, instead if (i), that, for all $q \ge -1$,

$$\mathrm{spec}(u_q) \subseteq \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n_\xi : |\xi| \le R2^q\}.$$

The following result will be crucial in the sequel.

Proposition 3. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that the following estimates hold true:*

(i) (Bernstein inequalities) for $u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$, $p \in [1 + \infty]$:

$$\|\nabla_x S_q u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \le C2^q\|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}, \quad q \ge 0,$$
$$\frac{1}{C}\|\Delta_q u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \le 2^{-q}\|\nabla_x\Delta_q u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \le C\|\Delta_q u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}, \quad q \ge 0.$$

For $q = -1$ only $\|\nabla_x\Delta_{-1}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \le C\|\Delta_{-1}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}$ holds.

(ii) (Commutator estimate) for $a \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ and $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$:

$$\|[S_{q'}a, \Delta_q]\Delta_p u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \le C2^{-p}\|\nabla S_{q'}a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\|\Delta_p u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}, \quad q' \ge 0,\ p, q \ge -1. \tag{14}$$

Proof. The proof of the Bernstein inequalities can be found in [9, Cor. 4.1.17]. The commutator estimate follows from [2, Th. 35]. This result applied to our case reads

$$\|[a, \Delta_q]\partial_{x_k} u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \leq C\|\nabla_x a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \tag{15}$$

for $a \in \mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ and $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$. Estimate (14) follows from (15) writing $\Delta_q u$ as a sum of derivatives. □

The proof of the following proposition can be found in [14, Prop. 1.5].

Proposition 4. *Let ω be a modulus of continuity. Then, for all $u \in C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$,*

$$\|\nabla_x S_q u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \leq C 2^q \omega(2^{-q}). \tag{16}$$

Conversely, given $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$, if (16) holds, then $u \in C^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$, where $\sigma(h) = \int_0^h \frac{\omega(t)}{t} dt$.

The main consequence of Proposition 4 is contained in the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Let ω be a modulus of continuity satisfying condition (9). Then a function $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ belongs to $C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ if and only if*

$$\sup_{q \in \mathbb{N}_0} \frac{\|\nabla_x (S_q u)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}}{2^q \omega(2^{-q})} < +\infty. \tag{17}$$

Other interesting properties of the Littlewood-Paley decomposition are contained in the following proposition.

Proposition 5. *Let $a \in C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$. Then, for all $q \geq -1$*

$$\|\Delta_q a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \leq C\|a\|_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \omega(2^{-q}), \tag{18}$$

and, if additionally (9) holds,

$$\|a - S_q a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \leq C\|a\|_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \omega(2^{-q}). \tag{19}$$

Proof. The proof of (18) is the same as [3, Prop. 3.4]. To prove the second estimate we note that

$$a - S_q a = \sum_{p \geq q} \Delta_p a$$

and therefore, from (18), we get

$$\|a - S_q a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \leq \sum_{p \geq q} \|\Delta_p a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \leq C\|a\|_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \sum_{p \geq q} \omega(2^{-p}).$$

An elementary computation gives that (9) is equivalent to $\sum_{p \geq q} \omega(2^{-p}) \leq \omega(2^{-q+1})$. This concludes the proof. □

Remark 4. *Estimate (19) implies that $(S_q a_{jk})_{j,k=1}^n$ is a positive matrix if $(a_{jk})_{j,k=1}^n$ is a positive matrix and q is sufficiently large.*

For later use we introduce a weighted Sobolev space.

Definition 4. *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and ω be a modulus of continuity. Let $\Omega(q) = 2^q \omega(2^{-q})$. We say that $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ belongs to $H^s_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ if*

$$\|u\|_{H^s_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} := \Big(\sum_{q \geq -1} 2^{2sq} \Omega^2(q) \|\Delta_q u\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} < +\infty.$$

3.2 Bony's paraproduct

Let us now define Bony's paraproduct (see [1]) for tempered distributions u and v as

$$T_u v = \sum_{q\geq 1}\sum_{p\leq q-2} \Delta_p u \Delta_q v = \sum_{q\geq 1} S_{q-1}u\Delta_q v.$$

Let us define also

$$R(u,v) = \sum_{\substack{q\geq -1\\ i\in\{0,\pm 1\}}} \Delta_q u \Delta_{q+i} v = \sum_{q\geq -1} \Delta_q u \tilde{\Delta}_q v, \quad \tilde{\Delta}_q := \Delta_{q-1}+\Delta_q+\Delta_{q+1}.$$

With this we can (formally) decompose a product uv with $u,\, v\in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ by

$$uv = T_u v + T_v u + R(u,v).$$

Proposition 6. *Let $a\in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$, $s\in\mathbb{R}$. Then the operator T_a maps $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ continuously into $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$, i.e. there exist a constant $C_s>0$ such that*

$$\|T_a u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \leq C_s \|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}.$$

The proof of this proposition can be found in [9, Prop. 5.2.1]. Other mapping properties, especially of the remainder $R(u,v)$, will be proved in Section 3.3.

Let now a and b be tempered distributions sufficiently regular such that ab makes sense. Then we have

$$\Delta_q(ab) = \Delta_q T_a b + \Delta_q T_b a + \Delta_q R(a,b) = \Delta_q T_a b + \Delta_q \tilde{R}(a,b),$$

where

$$\tilde{R}(a,b) = T_b a + R(a,b) = \sum_{q'\geq -1} S_{q'+2} b \Delta_{q'} a. \tag{20}$$

From the definition of Δ_q and S_q it is easy to verify that

$$\Delta_q(S_{q'-1}a\Delta_{q'}b) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad |q'-q|\geq 5, \tag{21}$$

and similarly

$$\Delta_q(S_{q'+2}a\Delta_{q'}b) = 0 \quad \text{if,} \quad q'\leq q-4, \tag{22}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_q(ab) &= \sum_{|q'-q|\leq 4} \Delta_q(S_{q'-1}a\Delta_{q'}b) + \sum_{q'>q-4} \Delta_q(S_{q'+2}b\Delta_{q'}a)\\
&= \sum_{|q'-q|\leq 4} [\Delta_q, S_{q'-1}a]\Delta_{q'}b + \sum_{|q'-q|\leq 4} S_{q'-1}a\Delta_q\Delta_{q'}b\\
&\quad + \sum_{q'>q-4} \Delta_q(S_{q'+2}b\Delta_{q'}a)\\
&= \sum_{|q'-q|\leq 4} [\Delta_q, S_{q'-1}a]\Delta_{q'}b + \sum_{|q'-q|\leq 4} (S_{q'-1}a - S_{q-1}a)\Delta_q\Delta_{q'}b\\
&\quad + \sum_{q'>q-4} \Delta_q(S_{q'+2}b\Delta_{q'}a) + \underbrace{\sum_{|q'-q|\leq 4} S_{q-1}a\Delta_q\Delta_{q'}b}_{=S_{q-1}a\Delta_q b}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\Delta_q(ab) = S_{q-1}a\Delta_q b + \mathcal{R}_q(a,b), \tag{23}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_q(a,b) = \sum_{|q'-q|\leq 4} [\Delta_q, S_{q'-1}a]\Delta_{q'}b + \sum_{|q'-q|\leq 4} (S_{q'-1}a - S_{q-1}a)\Delta_q\Delta_{q'}b + \sum_{q'>q-4} \Delta_q(S_{q'+2}b\Delta_{q'}a) = \mathcal{R}_q^{(1)}(a,b) + \mathcal{R}_q^{(2)}(a,b) + \mathcal{R}_q^{(3)}(a,b).$$

Let us remark that a consequence of (23) is that

$$\operatorname{spec} R_q(a,b) \subseteq \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n_\xi \,:\, |\xi| \leq \frac{10}{3}2^q\}. \tag{24}$$

3.3 Auxiliary estimates for $\mathcal{R}_q(a,b)$

In this section we prove an estimate about $\mathcal{R}_q(a,b)$ which we will use in the sequel.

Lemma 1. *Let ω be a modulus of continuity satisfying (9), $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\Omega(q)$ as in Definition 4. Let $a \in C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ and $b \in H^{-s}_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$. Then*

$$\Big(\sum_{q\geq -1} 2^{2(1-s)q} \left\| \mathcal{R}_q^{(i)}(a,b) \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_{s,i} \|a\|_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \|b\|_{H^{-s}_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}, \quad i = 1,\ 2. \tag{25}$$

Suppose moreover that $s \in (0,1)$ and ω satisfies (10) and (11). Then the estimate (25) holds also for $i = 3$.

Proof. Let us start with the inequality (25), for $i = 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_q^{(1)}(a,b) &= \sum_{|q'-q|\leq 4} [\Delta_q, S_{q'-1}a]\Delta_{q'}b \\ &= [\Delta_q, S_{q-5}a]\Delta_{q-4}b + [\Delta_q, S_{q-4}a]\Delta_{q-3}b + \cdots + [\Delta_q, S_{q+3}a]\Delta_{q+4}b. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Consider the first term of this sum. We have, from (14) and (17),

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\Delta_q, S_{q-5}a]\Delta_{q-4}b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} &\leq C2^{-(q-4)} \|\nabla_x S_{q-5}a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \|\Delta_{q-4}b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{2}\omega(2^{-(q-5)}) \|a\|_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \|\Delta_q b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $u \in H^{-s}_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ we have that

$$\|\Delta_{q-4}u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \leq \frac{2^{s(q-4)}}{\Omega(q-4)}\varepsilon_q = \frac{2^{(s-1)(q-4)}}{\omega(2^{-(q-4)})}\varepsilon_q,$$

where $(\varepsilon_q)_{q\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1}}$ is a sequence in $l^2(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1})$ and there exists $c_s \geq 1$ such that

$$\frac{1}{c_s} \|b\|_{H^{-s}_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \leq \|(\varepsilon_q)\|_{l^2(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1})} \leq c_s \|b\|_{H^{-s}_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}. \tag{27}$$

We get

$$2^{(1-s)q}\|[\Delta_q, S_{q-5}a]\Delta_{q-4}b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \leq C2^{3-4s}\frac{\omega(2^{-(q-5)})}{\omega(2^{-(q-4)})}\|a\|_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\varepsilon_{q-4} \leq C_s\|a\|_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\varepsilon_{q-4}. \tag{28}$$

For all the other terms in (26) we obtain an estimate similar to (28) and the inequality (25) follows.

Let us now consider the inequality (25), for $i = 2$. We have

$$\|\mathcal{R}_q^{(2)}(a,b)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} = \|(S_{q-2} - S_{q-1})a\Delta_q\Delta_{q-1}b + (S_q - S_{q-1})a\Delta_q\Delta_{q+1}b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}.$$

Since $S_{q-2}-S_{q-1}=-\Delta_{q-2}$ and $S_q-S_{q-1}=\Delta_{q-1}$, we deduce from (18),

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{R}_q^{(2)}(a,b)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} &\leq (\|\Delta_{q-2}a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}+\|\Delta_{q-1}a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)})\|\Delta_q b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\\ &\leq 2\,C\|a\|_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\omega(2^{-q})\frac{2^{sq}}{\Omega(q)}\varepsilon_q,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\|\Delta_q b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\leq\frac{2^{qs}}{\Omega(q)}\varepsilon_q$, where $(\varepsilon_q)_{q\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1}}$ is a sequence in $l^2(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1})$ satisfying (27). Therefore, remembering that $\Omega(q)=2^q\omega(2^{-q})$, we get

$$2^{(1-s)q}\|\mathcal{R}_q^{(2)}(a,b)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\leq 2\,C\|a\|_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\varepsilon_q.$$

Thus, inequality (25), for $i=2$, follows. Let now $s\in(0,1)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}R_q^{(3)}(a,b) &= \sum_{q'>q-4}\Delta_q(S_{q'+2}b\Delta_{q'}a)\\ &= \sum_{q'>q-4}\Big(\Delta_q(S_{q'-1}b\Delta_{q'}a)+\Delta_q\big(\Delta_{q'-1}b\Delta_{q'}a+\Delta_{q'}b\Delta_{q'}a+\Delta_{q'+1}b\Delta_{q'}a\big)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

From (21) and (22) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}R_q^{(3)}(a,b) &= \Delta_q\big(S_{q-4}b\Delta_{q-3}a+\cdots+S_{q+4}b\Delta_{q+5}a\big)\\ &\quad+\sum_{q'\geq -1}\Big(\Delta_q\big(\Delta_{q'-1}b\Delta_{q'}a+\Delta_{q'}b\Delta_{q'}a+\Delta_{q'+1}b\Delta_{q'}a\big)\Big).\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

The nine terms in the first line in (29) are essentially of the form $\Delta_q(S_{q-1}b\Delta_q a)$ and can be treated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{q\geq -1}2^{2(1-s)q}\|\Delta_q(S_{q-1}b\Delta_q a)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} &\leq \sum_{q\geq -1}2^{2(1-s)q}\|S_{q-1}b\Delta_q a\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\\ &\leq \sum_{q\geq -1}2^{2(1-s)q}\|S_{q-1}b\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\|\Delta_q a\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\\ &\leq \sum_{q\geq -1}2^{2(1-s)q}\Big(\sum_{p\leq q-2}\|\Delta_p b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\Big)^2\|\Delta_q a\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\\ &\leq \sum_{q\geq -1}2^{2(1-s)q}\Big(\sum_{p\leq q-2}\frac{2^{ps}}{\Omega(p)}\varepsilon_p\Big)^2 2^{-2q}\Omega^2(q)\|a\|^2_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\\ &\leq \sum_{q\geq -1}\Big(\sum_{p\leq q-2}2^{-s(q-p)}\frac{\Omega(q)}{\Omega(p)}\varepsilon_p\Big)^2\|a\|^2_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)},\end{aligned}$$

where $(\varepsilon_j)_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1}}$ is a sequence in $l^2(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1})$ with (27). From (10) and the definition of Ω we get

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_q:=\sum_{p\leq q-2}2^{-s(q-p)}\frac{\Omega(q)}{\Omega(p)}\varepsilon_p\leq\sum_{p\leq q-2}2^{(1-s)(q-p)}\omega(2^{-(q-p)})\varepsilon_p.$$

Then (11) and the Young inequality for convolution in l^p spaces give that the sequence $(\tilde{\varepsilon}_j)_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1}}$ is in $l^2(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1})$ and there exists $C_s>0$ such that

$$\|(\tilde{\varepsilon}_j)\|_{l^2(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1})}\leq\tilde{C}_s\|(\varepsilon_j)\|_{l^2(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1})}.$$

From (27) we conclude that

$$\sum_{q\geq -1}2^{2(1-s)q}\|\Delta_q(S_{q-1}b\Delta_q a)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\leq\tilde{C}_s^2\|(\varepsilon_j)\|^2_{l^2(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1})}\|a\|^2_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\leq C_s^2\|b\|^2_{H^{-s}_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\|a\|^2_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}.$$

The second line of (29) is a sum of three terms of the form $\sum_{q'\geq -1}\Delta_q\big(\Delta_{q'}b\Delta_{q'}a\big)$. We have

$$\sum_{q\geq -1}2^{2(1-s)q}\|\sum_{q'\geq -1}\Delta_q\big(\Delta_{q'}b\Delta_{q'}a\big)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}=\sum_{q\geq -1}2^{2(1-s)q}\|\Delta_q\big(\sum_{q'\geq -1}\Delta_{q'}b\Delta_{q'}a\big)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}.$$

Thanks to the result of Proposition 1, this last quantity coincides with $\|\sum_{q'\geq -1}\Delta_{q'}b\Delta_{q'}a\|^2_{H^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}$. To compute the $H^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ of $\sum_{q'\geq -1}\Delta_{q'}b\Delta_{q'}a$ we use Proposition 2. In fact $1-s>0$,

$$\mathrm{spec}(\Delta_{q'}b\Delta_{q'}a)\subseteq\{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n_\xi\,:\,|\xi|\leq\frac{16}{3}2^{q'}\},$$

and

$$2^{(1-s)q'}\|\Delta_{q'}b\Delta_{q'}a\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\leq 2^{(1-s)q'}\|\Delta_{q'}b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\|\Delta_{q'}a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\leq\varepsilon_{q'}\|a\|_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}.$$

Again (27) gives $\|\sum_{q'\geq -1}\Delta_{q'}b\Delta_{q'}a\|^2_{H^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\leq C_s\|b\|^2_{H^{-s}_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\|a\|^2_{C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}$. The proof of the lemma is concluded. □

4 The Carleman estimate

4.1 The weight function

The idea of constructing a weight function which is linked to the modulus of continuity is due to Tarama ([12], see also [5, 4, 6]). Let μ be a modulus of continuity satisfying (8). We set

$$\varphi(t):=\int_{\frac{1}{t}}^{1}\frac{1}{\mu(s)}ds.$$

The function φ is strictly increasing and $C^1([1,+\infty[)$. We have $\varphi([1,+\infty))=[0,+\infty)$ and $\varphi'(t)=1/(t^2\mu(1/t))>0$ for all $t\in[1,+\infty)$. We define

$$\Phi(\tau):=\int_0^\tau\varphi^{-1}(s)ds. \tag{30}$$

From this we get $\Phi'(t)=\varphi^{-1}(t)$ and therefore $\lim_{\tau\to+\infty}\Phi'(\tau)=+\infty$. Moreover we have

$$\Phi''(\tau)=\left(\Phi'(\tau)\right)^2\mu\left(\frac{1}{\Phi'(\tau)}\right) \tag{31}$$

for all $\tau\in[0,+\infty)$ and, since the function $\sigma\mapsto\sigma\mu(1/\sigma)$ is increasing on the interval $[1,+\infty)$, we obtain that

$$\lim_{\tau\to+\infty}\Phi''(\tau)=\lim_{\tau\to+\infty}\left(\Phi'(\tau)\right)^2\mu\left(\frac{1}{\Phi'(\tau)}\right)=+\infty.$$

4.2 The Carleman estimate

The uniqueness result of Theorem 1 will be a consequence of the following Carleman estimate.

Proposition 7. *Let μ and ω be two moduli of continuity such that $\omega(s)=\sqrt{\mu(s^2)}$. Suppose that μ and ω satisfy* (8) *and* (9), (10), (11) *respectively. Suppose that, for all $j,k=1,\dots,n$,*

$$a_{jk}\in C^\mu([0,T],L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x))\cap L^\infty([0,T],C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)),$$

and let (4) *hold. Let Φ and $H^s_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ defined in* (30) *and Definition 4 respectively. Let $s\in(0,1)$. Then there exist $\gamma_0\geq 1$, $C>0$, such that, for all $\gamma\geq\gamma_0$ and all $u\in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}_t\times\mathbb{R}^n_x)$ with*

$\mathrm{supp}(u) \subseteq [0, T/2] \times \mathbb{R}^n_x$,

$$\int_0^{T/2} e^{\frac{2}{\gamma}\Phi(\gamma(T-t))} \big\|\partial_t u + \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j}(a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} u)\big\|^2_{H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt \geq$$

$$C\gamma^{1/4} \int_0^{T/2} e^{\frac{2}{\gamma}\Phi(\gamma(T-t))} \big(\|\nabla u\|^2_{H^{-s}_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} + \gamma^{3/4}\|u\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\big) dt. \tag{32}$$

Setting

$$u(t,x) = e^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}\Phi(\gamma(T-t))} v(t,x),$$

the Carleman estimate (32) becomes

$$\int_0^{T/2} \big\|\partial_t v + \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j}(a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} v) + \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v\big\|^2_{H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt \geq$$

$$C\gamma^{1/4} \int_0^{T/2} \left(\|\nabla v\|^2_{H^{-s}_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} + \gamma^{3/4}\|v\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\right) dt. \tag{33}$$

The proof of such inequality is divided in several steps which we will present in the subsequent subsections.

4.3 Regularization in t

In our proof of the Carleman estimate we need to perform some integrations by part with respect to t and if the coefficients a_{jk} are not sufficiently regular this is not possible. We will avoid this difficulty regularizing the a_{jk}'s with respect to t and to this end we will use Friedrichs mollifiers. We take a $\rho \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\mathrm{supp}(\rho) \subseteq [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho(\tau)d\tau = 1$ and $\rho(\tau) = \rho(-\tau)$ and we define

$$a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} a(s,x)\rho\left(\frac{t-s}{\varepsilon}\right) ds.$$

We have easily

$$|a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x) - a_{jk}(t,x)| \leq C\mu(\varepsilon)$$

and

$$|\partial_t a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x)| \leq C\frac{\mu(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}.$$

where C depends only on $\|a_{j,k}\|_{C^\mu([0,T],L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x))}$.

4.4 Estimates for the microlocalized operator

Using the characterization of Sobolev spaces given in Proposition 1 we have that the left hand side part of (33) reads

$$\sum_{q\geq -1} 2^{-2sq} \int_0^{T/2} \Big\|\partial_t v_q + \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j}\left(\Delta_q(a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} v)\right) + \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q\Big\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt. \tag{34}$$

where we set $\Delta_q v := v_q$. We use formula (23) and we replace $a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} v$ with $(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x))\partial_{x_k} v_q + \mathcal{R}_q(a_{jk}, \partial_{x_k} v)$. We deduce that (34) is bounded from below by

$$\sum_{q\geq -1} 2^{-2sq-1} \int_0^{T/2} \left\| \partial_t v_q + \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j} \left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} v_q \right) + \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt$$
$$- \sum_{q\geq -1} 2^{-2sq} \int_0^{T/2} \left\| \partial_{x_j} \left(\mathcal{R}_q(a_{jk}, \partial_{x_k} v) \right) \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt.$$

We use now (24), the Bernstein inequalities and the result of Lemma 1 and we get

$$\sum_{q\geq -1} 2^{-2sq} \int_0^{T/2} \left\| \partial_{x_j} \left(\mathcal{R}_q(a_{jk}, \partial_{x_k} v) \right) \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt \leq C \int_0^{T/2} \|\nabla v\|^2_{H^{-s}_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt,$$

where C depends only on s and on $\max_{j,k} \|a_{j,k}\|_{L^\infty([0,T], C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x))}$. Finally, (33) will be a consequence of

$$\sum_{q\geq -1} 2^{-2sq} \int_0^{T/2} \left\| \partial_t v_q + \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j} \left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} v_q \right) \right) + \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt \geq$$
$$C\gamma^{1/4} \int_0^{T/2} \left(\|\nabla v\|^2_{H^{-s}_\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} + \gamma^{3/4} \|v\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} \right) dt.$$

We have

$$\int_0^{T/2} \left\| \partial_t v_q + \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j} \left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} v_q \right) + \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt$$
$$= \int_0^{T/2} \|\partial_t v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt + \int_0^{T/2} \left\| \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j} \left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} v_q \right) + \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt$$
$$+2\,\mathrm{Re} \int_0^{T/2} \left\langle \partial_t v_q \,|\, \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q \right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt + 2\,\mathrm{Re} \sum_{j,k=1}^n \int_0^{T/2} \left\langle \partial_t v_q \,|\, \partial_{x_j} \left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} v_q \right) \right\rangle dt.$$

We compute by integration by parts

$$2\,\mathrm{Re} \int_0^{T/2} \left\langle \partial_t v_q \,|\, \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q \right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt = \gamma \int_0^{T/2} \Phi''(\gamma(T-t)) \|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt$$

To handle the second scalar product we use the regularization from Section 4.3. In particular

$$|S_q a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x) - S_q a_{jk}(t,x)| \leq C\mu(\varepsilon), \quad \text{for all} \quad (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n_x \tag{35}$$

and

$$|\partial_t S_q a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x)| \leq C\frac{\mu(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}, \quad \text{for all} \quad (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n_x, \tag{36}$$

where C depends only on $\max_{j,k} \|a_{j,k}\|_{C^\mu([0,T],L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x))}$. Adding and subtracting $\partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v_q\right)$ we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&2\,\mathrm{Re}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_0^{T/2}\left\langle \partial_t v_q \,|\, \partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v_q\right)\right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\
&\quad= 2\,\mathrm{Re}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_0^{T/2}\left\langle \partial_t v_q \,|\, \partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v_q\right)\right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\
&\qquad+2\,\mathrm{Re}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_0^{T/2}\left\langle \partial_t v_q \,|\, \partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}(a_{jk}(t,x)-a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x))\partial_{x_k}v_q\right)\right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt. \qquad (37)
\end{aligned}
$$

By integration by parts we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&2\,\mathrm{Re}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_0^{T/2}\left\langle \partial_t v_q \,|\, \partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v_q\right)\right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\
&\qquad=\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_0^{T/2}\left\langle \partial_{x_j} v_q \,|\, \partial_t(S_{q-1}a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x))\partial_{x_k}v_q\right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

From (36) we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|2\,\mathrm{Re}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_0^{T/2}\left\langle \partial_t v_q \,|\, \partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v_q\right)\right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\right|\\
&\qquad\le\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_0^{T/2}\|\partial_{x_j}v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\|\partial_t(S_{q-1}a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x))\partial_{x_k}v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\
&\qquad\le C_1\frac{\mu(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}2^{2q}\int_0^{T/2}\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used the fact that $\|\partial_{x_k}v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\le C2^q\|v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_t(S_{q-1}a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x))\partial_{x_k}v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} &\le \|\partial_t(S_{q-1}a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x))\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\|\partial_{x_k}v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\\
&\le C2^q\frac{\mu(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}\|v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Remark that C_1 depends only on $\max_{j,k}\|a_{j,k}\|_{C^\mu([0,T],L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x))}$. For the second term in (37) we perform one integration by parts in x and the we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. We get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&2\,\mathrm{Re}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_0^{T/2}\left\langle \partial_t v_q \,|\, \partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}(a_{jk}(t,x)-a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x))\partial_{x_k}v_q\right)\right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\
&\quad=-2\,\mathrm{Re}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_0^{T/2}\left\langle \partial_{x_j}\partial_t v_q \,|\, \left(S_{q-1}(a_{jk}(t,x)-a^\varepsilon_{jk}(t,x)\right)\partial_{x_k}v_q\right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt,
\end{aligned}
$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|2\,\mathrm{Re}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_0^{T/2}\big\langle\partial_{x_j}\partial_t v_q\,|\,\big(S_{q-1}(a_{jk}(t,x)-a^{\varepsilon}_{jk}(t,x)\big)\,\partial_{x_k}v_q\big\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\,dt\Big|\\
&\quad\le\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_0^{T/2}\|\partial_{x_k}\partial_t v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\|\,\big(S_{q-1}(a_{jk}(t,x)-a^{\varepsilon}_{jk}(t,x)\big)\,\partial_{x_k}v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\
&\quad\le C\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_0^{T/2}2^{2q}\|\partial_t v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\mu(\varepsilon)\|v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\
&\quad\le\int_0^{T/2}\|\partial_t v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt+C_2 2^{4q}\mu(\varepsilon)\int_0^{T/2}\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (see (35))

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\,\big(S_{q-1}(a_{jk}(t,x)-a^{\varepsilon}_{jk}(t,x)\big)\,\partial_{x_k}v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\\
&\qquad\le\|\,\big(S_{q-1}(a_{jk}(t,x)-a^{\varepsilon}_{jk}(t,x)\big)\,\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\|\partial_{x_k}v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\\
&\qquad\le C2^q\mu(\varepsilon)\|v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}
\end{aligned}$$

and the fact that $\mu^2(\varepsilon)\le\mu(1)\mu(\varepsilon)$; remark that here the constant C_2 depends only on μ and on $\max_{j,k}\|a_{j,k}\|_{C^\mu([0,T],L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x))}$.

Resuming, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{T/2}\Big\|\partial_t v_q+\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\partial_{x_j}\left(\Delta_q(a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v)\right)+\Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q\Big\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\
&\quad\ge\int_0^{T/2}\Big\|\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v_q\right)+\Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q\Big\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\
&\qquad+\gamma\int_0^{T/2}\Phi''(\gamma(T-t))\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt-C_3\Big(\frac{\mu(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}2^{2q}+2^{4q}\mu(\varepsilon)\Big)\int_0^{T/2}\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt,
\end{aligned}\tag{38}$$

where C_3 depends only on $\max_{j,k}\|a_{j,k}\|_{C^\mu([0,T],L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_x))}$.

4.5 End of the proof: high frequencies.

We detail the end of the proof, starting with the high frequencies. We follow the lines of [5, 6]. By Remark 4 there exist $q_0\ge-1$ and a constant $C_4>0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v_q\right)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\|v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\\
&\qquad\ge\Big|\Big\langle\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v_q\right)\,|\,v_q\Big\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\Big|\ge\frac{a_0}{2}\|\nabla_x v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\ge C_4a_0 2^{2q}\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)},
\end{aligned}$$

where a_0 is the constant in (4).

Suppose first that $\Phi'(\gamma(T-t))\le\frac{1}{2}C_4a_0 2^{2q}$. Then, from the last inequality, we deduce

$$\|\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v_q\right)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}-\Phi'(\gamma(T-t))\|v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\ge\frac{1}{2}C_4a_0 2^{2q}.$$

We choose $\varepsilon = 2^{-2q}$ in such a way that the quantities $2^{4q}\mu(\varepsilon)$ and $2^{2q}\dfrac{\mu(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}$ are equal. Using the fact that $\Phi''(\gamma(T-t)) \geq 1$ (this is a consequence of the nonrestrictive hypothesis that $\mu(1) = 1$; if it is not so, the modifications of the subsequent lines are easy), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{T/2} \Big\|\partial_t v_q + \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j}\left(\Delta_q(a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v)\right) + \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q\Big\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt \\
&\quad\geq \int_0^{T/2} \Big(\Big\| \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v_q\right)\Big\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} - \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))\|v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\Big)^2 \\
&\qquad+\gamma\int_0^{T/2}\Phi''(\gamma(T-t))\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt - 2C_3 2^{4q}\mu(2^{-2q})\int_0^{T/2}\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt \\
&\qquad\geq \int_0^{T/2}\Big((\frac{1}{2}C_4a_0)^2 2^{4q} + \gamma - 2C_3 2^{4q}\mu(2^{-2q})\Big)\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt \\
&\qquad\quad\geq \int_0^{T/2}\Big(\Big(\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}C_4a_0)^2 - 2C_3(\mu(2^{-2q}))\Big)2^{4q} + \frac{\gamma}{3}\Big)\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt \\
&\qquad\qquad+\int_0^{T/2}\Big(\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}C_4a_0)^2 2^{4q} + \frac{2}{3}\gamma\Big)\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Since we have $\lim_{q\to+\infty}\mu(2^{-2q}) = 0$, there exists an $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that

$$\Big(\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}C_4a_0)^2 - 2C_3)\mu(2^{-2q}))\Big)2^{4q} + \frac{\gamma}{3} \geq 0$$

for $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$ and all $q \geq q_0$. Consequently, for $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{T/2} \Big\|\partial_t v_q + \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j}\left(\Delta_q(a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v)\right) + \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q\Big\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt \\
&\qquad\geq \int_0^{T/2}\Big(\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}C_4a_0)^2 2^{4q} + \frac{2}{3}\gamma\Big)\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall now (11). Using it with $s = 1/2$, we have that three exists $C_0 > 0$ such that, for all $q \geq -1$, we have $\mu(2^{-2q}) \leq C_0 2^{-q}$. Then, for all $q \geq -1$ and for all $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$,

$$\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}C_4a_0)^2 2^{4q} + \frac{1}{6}\gamma \geq C_5\gamma^{\frac{1}{4}}2^{3q} \geq C_6\gamma^{\frac{1}{4}}2^{4q}\mu(2^{-2q}),$$

for some $C_5,\ C_6 > 0$. Finally

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{T/2} \Big\|\partial_t v_q + \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j}\left(\Delta_q(a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v)\right) + \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q\Big\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt \\
&\qquad\geq \int_0^{T/2}\Big(\frac{\gamma}{2} + C_6\gamma^{\frac{1}{4}}2^{4q}\mu(2^{-2q})\Big)\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt. \qquad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose now $\Phi'(\gamma(T-t)) \geq \frac{1}{2}C_4 a_0 2^{2q}$. Again we choose $\varepsilon = 2^{-2q}$. Then, using (31), the fact that $a_0 \leq 1$ and the properties of μ, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi''(\gamma(T-t)) &= (\Phi'(\gamma(T-t)))^2 \mu\left(\frac{1}{\Phi'(\gamma(T-t))}\right)\\ &\geq (\frac{1}{2}C_4 a_0)^2 2^{4q}\mu\left(\frac{2}{C_4 a_0}2^{-2q}\right) \geq (\frac{1}{2}C_4 a_0)^2 2^{4q}\mu(2^{-2q}).\end{aligned}$$

Hence there exist γ_0 and constants $C_7, C_8 > 0$ such that, for $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^{T/2} \left\|\partial_t v_q + \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j}\left(\Delta_q(a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} v)\right) + \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} dt\\ &\geq \int_0^{T/2} \Big(\Big\| \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} v_q\right)\Big\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)} - \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))\|v_q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}\Big)^2\\ &\quad +\gamma\int_0^{T/2} \Phi''(\gamma(T-t))\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt - 2C_3 2^{4q}\mu(2^{-2q})\int_0^{T/2}\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\ &\quad\geq \int_0^{T/2}\Big(\frac{\gamma}{2} + (\frac{\gamma}{2}(\frac{1}{2}C_4 a_0)^2 - 2C_3)2^{4q}\mu(2^{-2q})\Big)\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\ &\quad\quad\geq \int_0^{T/2}\Big(\frac{\gamma}{2} + C_7\gamma 2^{4q}\mu(2^{-2q})\Big)\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\ &\quad\quad\quad\geq \int_0^{T/2}\Big(\frac{\gamma}{2} + C_8\gamma^{\frac{1}{4}}2^{4q}\mu(2^{-2q})\Big)\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt. \qquad (40)\end{aligned}$$

Recall now that $2^{2q}\mu(2^{-2q}) = 2^{2q}\omega^2(2^{-q}) = \Omega^2(q)$. From (39) and (40) we immediately obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{q\geq q_0} 2^{-2sq}\int_0^{T/2}\left\|\partial_t v_q + \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} v_q\right) + \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\ &\quad\geq \sum_{q\geq q_0} 2^{-2sq}\int_0^{T/2}\Big(\frac{\gamma}{2} + C\gamma^{\frac{1}{4}}\Omega^2(q)2^{2q}\Big)\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt. \qquad (41)\end{aligned}$$

4.6 End of the proof: low frequencies.

In this section we complete the proof for low frequencies. We sum (38) multiplied with 2^{-2qs} for $q \leq q_0 - 1$ (q_0 is the same as in the previous section). We set $\varepsilon = 2^{-2q_0}$ and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{q\leq q_0-1} 2^{-2sq}\int_0^{T/2}\left\|\partial_t v_q + \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k} v_q\right) + \Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt\\ &\quad\geq \sum_{q\leq q_0-1} 2^{-2sq}\int_0^{T/2}\Big(\gamma - 2C_3\mu(2^{-2q_0})2^{2(q+q_0)}\Big)\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt.\end{aligned}$$

Taking γ_0 large enough we can absorb the negative term. We easily obtain

$$\sum_{q\le q_0-1} 2^{-2sq}\int_0^{T/2}\Big\|\partial_t v_q+\sum_{j,k=1}^n\partial_{x_j}\left(S_{q-1}a_{jk}(t,x)\partial_{x_k}v_q\right)+\Phi'(\gamma(T-t))v_q\Big\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt$$
$$\ge\sum_{q\le q_0-1}2^{-2sq}\int_0^{T/2}\Big(\frac{\gamma}{2}+C\gamma^{\frac14}\Omega^2(q)2^{2q}\Big)\|v_q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_x)}dt. \tag{42}$$

Summing (41) and (42) we obtain (33). The proof is completed.

Acknowledgements

The first author is member of the Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM).

A part of this work was done while the third author was visiting the Department of Mathematics and Geosciences of Trieste University with the support of GNAMPA–INdAM.

References

[1] J.-M. Bony, *Calcul symbolique et propagation des singularités pour les équations aux dérivées partielles non linéaires*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **14** (1981), no. 2, 209–246.

[2] R. R. Coifman and Y. Meyer, "Au-delà des opérateurs pseudo-différentiel", Astérisque **57**, Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 1978.

[3] F. Colombini and N. Lerner, *Hyperbolic operators with non-Lipschitz coefficients*, Duke Math. J. **77** (1995), no. 3, 657–698.

[4] D. Del Santo, *A remark on the uniqueness for backward parabolic operators with non-Lipschitz-continuous coefficients*, in "Evolution equations of hyperbolic and Schrödinger type", M. Ruzhansky, M. Sugimoto, J. Wirth eds., Progress in Mathematics **301**, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2012, pp. 103–114.

[5] D. Del Santo, and M. Prizzi, *Backward uniqueness for parabolic operators whose coefficients are non-Lipschitz continuous in time*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **84** (2005), no. 4, 471–491.

[6] D. Del Santo and M. Prizzi, *A new result on backward uniqueness for parabolic operators*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) (2014), DOI 10.1007/s10231-013-0381-3.

[7] J.-L. Lions and B. Malgrange, *Sur l'unicité rétrograde dans les problèmes mixtes paraboliques*, Math. Scand. **8** (1960), 277–286.

[8] N. Mandache, *On a counterexample concerning unique continuation for elliptic equations in divergence form with Hölder continuous coefficients*, Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **1** (1998), 273–292.

[9] G. Métivier, "Para-differential calculus and applications to the Cauchy problem for nonlinear systems", Centro di Ricerca Matematica Ennio De Giorgi (CRM) Series **5**, Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, 2008.

[10] K. Miller, *Nonunique continuation for uniformly parabolic and elliptic equations in self-adjoint divergence form with Hölder continuous coefficients*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **54** (1974), 105–117.

[11] P. C. Rosenbloom and D. V. Widder, *A temperature function which vanishes initially*, Amer. Math. Monthly **65** (1958), no. 8, 607–609.

[12] S. Tarama, *Local uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for second order elliptic equations with non-Lipschitzian coefficients*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **33** (1997), no. 1, 167–188.

[13] M. E. Taylor, "Pseudodifferential operators and nonlinear PDE", Progress in Mathematics **100**, Birkhäuser Boston inc., Boston, MA, 1991.

[14] M. E. Taylor, "Tools for PDE", Mathematical Surveys and Monographs **81**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.

[15] A. Tychonoff, *Théorèmes d'unicité pour l'équation de la chaleur*, Mat. Sb. **42** (1935), no. 2, 199–216 .

[16] C. Zuily, "Uniqueness and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem", Progress in Mathematics **33**, Birkhäuser Boston inc., Boston, MA, 1983.

Daniele Del Santo
Dipartimento di Matematica e Geoscienze
Università di Trieste
Via Valerio 12/1, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
delsanto@units.it

Christian Jäh
Institut für Angewandte Analysis
Fakultät für Mathematik und Informatik
Technische Universität Bergakademie Freiberg
Prüferstrasse 9, D-09596 Freiberg, Germany
christian.jaeh@math.tu-freiberg.de

Marius Paicu
Institut de Mathématiques de Bordeaux
Université Bordeaux 1
351, cours de la Libération, F-33405 Talence cedex, France
Marius.Paicu@math.u-bordeaux1.fr